

Alexandria Latragna

From: Amanda Park <amandapark820@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, September 22, 2021 6:56 AM
To: Bruces Beach Task Force
Subject: [EXTERNAL] HAB and Plaque

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

CAUTION: This Email is from an EXTERNAL source. Ensure you trust this sender before clicking on any links or attachments.

Thank you HAB for your dedication and hard work.

It is evident you have spent countless hours researching and fine tuning the historical account of Bruce's Beach.

You have taken into consideration suggestions by experts in the field, as well as followed the direction from city council.

The substance and tone of the plaque language is appropriate and on point.

Although the history of Bruce's Beach is not something the city is proud of, it needs to be accurately told based on research the HAB has conducted. I urge the city council to accept the plaque language as written so current and future generations can learn from the past and move forward.

Amanda Park
20 year resident of MB

Alexandria Latragna

From: Gary McAulay <gary.mcaulay@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, September 22, 2021 5:14 AM
To: Bruces Beach Task Force
Subject: [EXTERNAL] for the History Advisory Board meeting

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

CAUTION: This Email is from an EXTERNAL source. Ensure you trust this sender before clicking on any links or attachments.

Hello HAB

My apologies for the last-minute comments on this document. I was unavailable this weekend when it was released. I'm pretty sure that I have commented on some of these items before, but I will go ahead and repeat my remarks just to be sure.

I would like to provide newspaper citations but, unfortunately, my D drive, which holds my photographs (including shots of MB News articles), is "not accessible" at the moment. Repair guy comes tomorrow.

I have **highlighted** the text that I find problematic. My comments are in **blue**. I welcome any corrections or feedback.

Regards
Gary D. McAulay

The History of Bruce's Beach

Willa Bruce – A Pioneering Entrepreneur

In February 1912, Willie "Willa" Ann Bruce (b. 1862, Missouri) purchased a lot on the Strand in Manhattan Beach, determined to create a destination where Black Angelinos could relax and enjoy the ocean. [MORE HISTORICAL CONTEXT?? QR CODE?] During the time of Jim Crow-era exclusionary real estate practices, Willa proclaimed to the Los Angeles Times, "Wherever we have tried to buy land for a beach resort we have been refused. But I own this land and I'm going to keep it."

While her husband Charles Aaron Bruce (b. 1860, District of Columbia) worked as a dining car chef on the train between Los Angeles and Salt Lake City, Mrs. Bruce ran the business. It officially opened on June 17, 1912, with a small portable cottage that rented bathing suits, offered changing rooms, and sold refreshments to the beachgoing public. Notably, it was one of the few places along the Pacific Coast where Black beachgoers could access such amenities.

Harassment of the Bruces and their guests by some White neighbors occurred immediately after the resort opened. According to the Los Angeles Times, "No Trespassing" signs were posted in front of the Bruces' resort on a strip of beach owned by subdivider George Peck where constables forced Black guests – and only Black guests – to walk a half mile out of the way to reach the water.

The story about the deputy constables was reported by the Los Angeles Times in 1912 and does not, as I recall, detail different treatment of Blacks by the constables. The "and only Black guests" appears to be conflating the story of the deputy constables in 1912 with the admitted discriminatory treatment of Blacks by Officer Haddock in 1927, as reported by the California Eagle via Brigham p 89.

To be factual, it should read, "...a strip of beach owned by subdivider George Peck. Deputy constables patrolled the property. Black guests had to walk a half mile out of the way to reach the water."

Despite this intimidation, hundreds – and, at times, thousands – of Black beachgoers visited the beachside (redundant) resort. By the summer of 1916, the Bruces' replaced their portable cottage with a two-story structure that included changing rooms, a dance hall, and restaurant. Encouraged by the Bruces' success, other Black families purchased land in the surrounding area and built cottages and vacation homes, creating a summer community for Black Angelinos.

With the influx of Black landowners, some White citizens were concerned that this "Negro invasion" would negatively affect their property values.

I would rewrite this to say, "Some White citizens were concerned that the influx of Black landowners would negatively affect their property values."

The sensationalist phrase "Negro invasion" was a newspaper headline writer's hook, although I've seen no documented use in local papers. To be clear, Brigham actually does not use quotes on the phrase "Negro invasion," but rather simply places quotes around the word "invasion," much as he places quotation marks on many words ("concentration," "pioneers," "domain," "help," "legislate," "law breakers," "park," etc. without attributing use to anybody. It is part of his writing style. Example:

The departure of Mrs. Atkinson, the last of the "condemned" to leave Manhattan, did not completely free the community from the Negro "menace."

Brigham used the word "invasion" six times in different parts of his thesis without specific attribution to anyone as a quote. He similarly used the words "menace" and "problem" in quotes, thusly: Negro "problem" and Negro "menace," also without attribution.

Alison R Jefferson, in her doctoral dissertation, referred to the phrase "Negro invasion" as "hyperbolic."

I believe that the idea for MB was to write a factual plaque. This loaded phrase does not belong there.

To protect their interests, they pressured the Board of Trustees to impose a series of regulations aimed at thwarting the Bruces' business and driving the Black community out of the City.

What is the citation for this, please? There was a petition to condemn the property for a park, but what was the pressure "to impose a series of regulations aimed at thwarting the Bruces' business...?"

One of Brigham's interviewees, 30 years later, "remembered this as being clearly aimed at the Negroes of Manhattan." According to Brigham, real estate salesman Lindsey "confirmed this opinion." But how was this *opinion* confirmed, thirty years later, by someone who was not a trustee? Two opinions hardly make a fact.

There were documented concerns in the community about the commercialization of the beach front, about "concessions." People were already looking at Venice and Santa Monica, preferring to keep Manhattan Beach residential, or a "home" community. And, the board of trustees had already been approached by applicants to open a pool hall in one case, and a restaurant with a pool hall in another. Pool halls, in the 1920s, were considered disreputable places. The ordinances passed at the time, now supposedly aimed at the Bruce's, remained in place in some form for many decades, and I believe most if not all are still on the books, not to discriminate against anyone, but to maintain quality of life and a family community. Similar ordinances exist in virtually every city.

In 1924, the Board of Trustees passed Ordinance No. 282, which ordered the acquisition by condemnation of Blocks 5 and 12 in Peck's Manhattan Beach with the stated intention of creating a public park. The area included 30 lots, of which only five were developed. These five lots were owned by members of the Black resort community and included Bruce's Beach.

The Racist Motivation Behind the Eminent Domain Action [QR CODE LINKING TO THE DETAILED EVIDENCE SHOWING THE RACIST MOTIVATION]

In 1943, Frank Daugherty, a member of the City's 1924 Board of Trustees, admitted to the Manhattan Beach News, "Our attorneys advised the members of the council never to admit the real purpose in establishing the park..." In a February 4, 1927, letter to the Manhattan Beach News, the Bruce family wrote: "...the attempt to make a park out of these two blocks was a direct slap at us because we were not born white people."

Daugherty claimed in 1943 that he was on the Board of Trustees when they voted to condemn the property for a park. He said that, "I have always thought that was about the meanest thing I have ever done, but I suppose I had to, and all of us felt the same way about it."

However, that vote, on June 5, 1924, was by Trustees George E. Delavan Jr., Cassius Robbins, M.J. Crandall, J.E. Rhind, and C.D. Edwards. (MB News, June 6, 1924, p1) and (HAB Report footnote p25).

It's hard to say if Daugherty just got his memory a bit muddled or if he was embroidering stories in his old age. Brigham wrote, "Information derived from individuals either through interview or correspondence, although essential, had definite limitations. One must bear in mind that the questionee was attempting to bridge mentally a span of three decades. Undoubtedly, answers were frequently conditioned by (1) faulty memory, (2) efforts at self-justification, or (3) the suggestive power of the question."

The Legacy of Bruce's Beach

On May 16, 1927, the Bruce family left Manhattan Beach. They requested \$70,000 for their property and \$50,000 in damages; the Court awarded them \$14,500. The resort was soon demolished, but the Bruces' legacy would persevere. A series of peaceful protests occurred that summer along the Manhattan Beach shoreline supported by the NAACP, details of which can be found on the additional plaque on Highland Avenue.

ADD TO REPORT

PAGE 27 – to the paragraph starting with "Some citizens..."

Local newspapers revealed that not everyone in Manhattan Beach supported the actions of the Board of Trustees. The Manhattan Beach Globe, a newspaper sponsored and written by members of the Taxpayers' Protective League, argued against the assessments levied against property owners that would pay for the condemned property. One editorial, written by outspoken critic of the Trustees Ralph F. Wedler, said: "Park and Playground, why? Original idea to get the colored people out. Does it accomplish it? No." [THEN BLEND TO...] "One thing all white people in the city of Manhattan Beach are in accord on and that is to make Manhattan Beach a hundred per cent (sic) white beach."

Why "sic"? "Per cent" although now more commonly "percent," was and is still acceptable spelling.

A February 11, 1927, editorial by the Manhattan Beach News supporting the Board of Trustees argued: "While the purchase of the property does not eliminate colored people from Manhattan Beach entirely, the steps taken to acquire the former stronghold of the negroes in this city, while having respect for the rights of the colored man, did not desire that he should make it his playground."

MOVE TO OTHER PLAQUE?

KKK

On July 4, 1924, the California Eagle reported that Black fishermen in Redondo Beach were given Ku Klux Klan pamphlets labelled "Colored Folks Beach three miles North."

I think this article might be double checked. I don't seem to have a copy of that article, but Brigham's thesis does not say that "pamphlets" (plural) were "labelled "Colored Folks Beach three miles North." His thesis says that three Black fishermen were approached by a man who gave them a pamphlet entitled "The Ideals of the Ku Klux Klan." In the margin of one of the pages was penciled the note "Colored Folks Beach three miles north." Just to be accurate.

More importantly, that incident occurred in Redondo Beach. It is illustrative of some attitudes of the time, but does not go specifically to the eminent domain action in MB.

The Eagle speculated that the Klan was “operating unrestrictedly along the waterfront,” including Manhattan Beach. While there is no definitive evidence of Klan involvement, the article suggested that the Klan influenced the Board of Trustees in condemning Bruce’s Beach. Unsupported speculation by a newspaper is not sufficient to include, on the plaque, allegations that the KKK influenced the Board of Trustees. The plaques are supposed to be factual.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION Although the Bruce family were compelled to **abandon their dreams** in Manhattan Beach, Not objective writing. My understanding is that the purpose of the plaques and the report were to find the facts of Bruce’s Beach.

“...the Bruce family were compelled to abandon their business in Manhattan Beach,”

...the memory of the **diverse community** endures.

I would suggest instead, “...the memory of the nascent Black community endures.” A Black enclave is not “diverse” simply by being Black.

On June 5, 1924, the Board of Trustees passed four ordinances directed at beachfront operations within the city:

- Ordinance 273 prohibited the opening of any new bathhouses **along the Strand**.

“Along the Strand,” or “east of the Pacific Electric right-of-way”?

- Ordinance 274 imposed new regulations on all businesses and recreation establishments operation within the city.
- Ordinance 275 prohibited dressing or undressing in any vehicle within the city limits as well as any tents or changing rooms – temporary or otherwise.
- Ordinance 276 formally declared the City’s intention to acquire Blocks 5 and 12 in Peck’s Manhattan Beach for the stated purpose of building a public park.

Alexandria Latragna

From: Bruce's Beach Get the Facts <brucebeachgetthefacts@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 21, 2021 11:51 PM
To: Bruces Beach Task Force
Subject: [EXTERNAL] HAB Meeting 9_22_21

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

CAUTION: This Email is from an EXTERNAL source. Ensure you trust this sender before clicking on any links or attachments.

Dear HAB,
Bruce's Beach Get The Facts received the following letter from a resident yesterday.
This news he writes about is alarming.
We have NOT sent it to our subscriber list at this time.
If what this resident is stating is true, we hope the HAB will make the necessary corrections in the History Report.

~BBGTF

September 20, 2021

Dear History Advisory Board (HAB),

I have sent the following to 'Bruce's Beach Get the Facts' and have given my permission to print it in their newsletter.

Sincerely,

An 18 year MB Resident defending truth in our history

[New evidence kills the History Report's Claim of Racial Discrimination in MB](#)

What is the HAB going to do now that their Star Witness, Frank Daugherty, was found to have lied?

The HAB uses Daugherty's "confession" as foundational evidence to build a 70+ page story that MB was a racist city during the time the Bruce's owned their business.

Daugherty claimed he and his fellow Board of Trustee Members were motivated by racial discrimination to enact Eminent Domain on the Bruce Property.

This "confession" turns out to be a fabrication because Daugherty was NOT on the Board of Trustees during the time Eminent Domain was enacted!

How did the HAB miss this fact when the list of Board members is in the footnotes of its own History Report?

The "Daugherty reveal" was the last shot that killed this Report but only after City Council shredded it in the 7/20 meeting with the HAB.

After learning that a member of the HAB colluded with a Bruce Family member to fabricate a lie, 4 of the 5 Council Members FINALLY united and took turns exposing the inherent problems with this History Report.

Kristin Long Drew, Lead Writer and who appears to be the spokesperson for the HAB, was peppered with questions, especially from Napolitano, and left on her own searching for a defensible position that never came.

- COLLUSION: During a HAB meeting, it was revealed the Bruce Family member Dwayne Shepherd and a member of the HAB colluded to fabricate a lie that the Board of Trustees made their eminent domain decision at the behest of the KKK. Shepherd has been trying to create a case to sue MB for acts that occurred in the 1920s. The HAB Member is no longer on the HAB
- Napolitano revealed the Report provides no evidence for the following during the time Eminent Domain was enacted:
 - No presence of KKK in MB
 - No racial violence in MB
 - Nobody in MB used the term “invasion” to describe POC buying property in MB
 - Arresting a POC for trespassing is not racist
- Hadley noted that the language used in the Report has a biased tone, and it puts a “thumb on the scale.”
- Franklin noted many of the stories are speculation, opinions, and uncorroborated stories.
- Many of the stories about the Board of Trustees trying to run POC out of MB conflict with the facts: a black family, the Slaughters, lived next to the Bruce business and the Board did not enact Eminent Domain on their property. They later opened a business on their property and the Board allowed it despite the ordinance against operating a business in the residential area. And POC purchased the property in MB before AND after the Eminent Domain decision, and they were NOT segregated.

Once you take out the Daugherty lie and take out all of the fallacies raised by Council, the claim of racial discrimination falls like a ton of bricks. So how will the HAB proceed?

Will it issue a Statement of Apology to the Residents of Manhattan Beach for publishing a Report based on a lie that dragged our city through the mud for 12 months and fueled press coverage that wrongly smeared our city as racist?

Will it issue a Statement to all the Media Outlets, including the Beach Reporter, correcting the facts and ask that it be published?

Will it send a letter to actress Viola Davis informing her that the Report is not a credible source to be used to develop a TV show about Bruce’s Beach?

And most importantly, will it issue a letter to the MB School Board notifying them that the Report is wrong and SHOULD NOT be used in the school curriculum?

Without question, the events that took place over the last 11 months should have never happened to our city. There is plenty of blame to go around as to how the events unfolded and who all is responsible, but it’s best that City Council brings this chapter to a close so our community can move forward.

The HAB should issue the statements above because it is the right and responsible thing to do. The current History Report must be removed from the City website immediately so no further false stories will be generated from it.

And the video must be taken down since it is not factual.

It’s time for the HAB to issue a new, concise Report to Council listing all of the new facts uncovered and listing all of the stories and rumors that cannot be corroborated.

This would fulfill the original mission the Bruce’s Beach Task Force was given nearly a year ago.

Alexandria Latragna

From: Anthony A. Lee <member1700@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 21, 2021 2:12 PM
To: Bruces Beach Task Force
Subject: [EXTERNAL] In Support of the Plaques and the History Advisory Board

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

CAUTION: This Email is from an EXTERNAL source. Ensure you trust this sender before clicking on any links or attachments.

Dear Friends and former Colleagues:

I was so disappointed that the City Council of Manhattan Beach did not approve the language that your board submitted for the new plaques at Bruce's Beach. I thought that the history you presented was accurate and that language and tone were wholly appropriate to that episode of our past.

I hope that the board will not water down its findings or its language to whitewash the racism that motivated the confiscation of the Bruce properties (as well as others) some one-hundred years ago. Whatever changes you make should be minimal and should not threaten the integrity of your work.

I will look forward to seeing the new plaques go up soon.

Sincerely,
Anthony A. Lee

Alexandria Latragna

From: roycasey@aol.com
Sent: Tuesday, September 21, 2021 1:50 PM
To: Bruces Beach Task Force
Cc: List - City Council
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Bruce's Beach - Issues raised by City Council with History Report and plaque language
Attachments: Details of Issues raised during 7-20-21 CC meeting, plus commentary.pdf
Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

CAUTION: This Email is from an EXTERNAL source. Ensure you trust this sender before clicking on any links or attachments.

Attached is a complete listing of issues raised by City Council and the community with the Bruce's Beach History Report and plaque language.

Hopefully, this listing will assist the History Advisory Board in tracking all issues raised to ensure each issue is addressed properly.

I have also included excerpts from the 7/20/21 City Council meeting and select HAB meetings to add clarity.

I look forward to attending the next HAB meeting on Zoom so I can following along and make note of how each issue raised is resolved in the History Report and proposed plaque language.

Thanks,
Roy

DETAILED LISTING OF ISSUES

Here is a detailed listing of major issues raised by MB City Council on 7/20/21 & the community re Bruce's Beach History Report & Plaque Language, along with recommendations for steps needed to resolve each issue. This listing will help track how the Board resolves these issues. The issues are listed in the same sequence as they came up during the 7/20/21 Council meeting, and the numbers below are cross referenced to excerpts taken from a transcript of the meeting as shown in the next section of this document.

1. **Evidence may be inadequate that Eminent Domain was racially motivated** after all issues are resolved.
Re-evaluate this position after all issues & related evidence have been researched, analyzed and re-evaluated.
2. History Report will be linked to plaques via QR codes and used for school curriculums.
Therefore, the **History Report must be updated**, as well as plaque language, to reflect resolution of all issues.
3. **MB allowed the Black Slaughter Family to open a Beach House** that was in violation of a City Ordinance.
Make a point that this behavior conflicts with position that the Board of Trustees was racially motivated and tried to run Black property owners out of town.
4. **3 Black Families owned property immediately next to Eminent Domain property** but it was not taken.
Make a point that this behavior conflicts with position that the Board of Trustees was racially motivated and tried to run Black property owners out of town.
5. The **Black Slaughter Family was included in the MB community as a "prominent" family**.
Make a point that this behavior conflicts with position that the Board of Trustees was racially motivated and tried to run Black property owners out of town.
6. Arresting a person of color for **trespassing** on private property is not Racist.
Remove the story about Elizabeth Cali as being off-topic and lacking evidence of Racism.
7. Was it George Lindsey who used **the term "Invasion"** in 1920's or was it Brigham in his 1954 Thesis?
There is no evidence it was George Lindsey, therefore, remove entire subject matter.
8. **Language recommended by Bruce Family** made it falsely appear that Lindsey said **"invasion"** in the 1920's.
Remove this entire story of "invasion" from everywhere in the History Report and plaque language.
9. **There is NO evidence of KKK involvement or influence on the Board of Trustees** in deciding to enact Eminent Domain and the idea of including stories about the KKK came from Dwayne Shepherd on behalf of Bruce's.
10. **Dwayne Shepherd recommended wording that would seem to justify higher claims** in a threatened lawsuit.
All input from the Bruce Family should be reanalyzed for correctness and evaluation of factual content.
11. **ALERT - Frank Daugherty was not on MB Board of Trustees when Eminent Domain resolution was passed.**
Mr. Daugherty's testimony was the foundational evidence for motive of **racial discrimination** (see #1 above).
12. There is **no evidence of a Grand Jury investigation or Racial Violence** in MB during time of Eminent Domain.
Remove all of these stories from the History Report and plaque language.
13. Open Question about **Unfair Compensation to Bruce Family**.
Simply state the Bruce's were paid **above market value** for their property and received due process of law.
14. **All Black Families affected by Eminent Domain repurchased property in MB, except the Bruce's.**
Make a point that this behavior conflicts with position that the Board of Trustees was racially motivated and tried to run Black property owners out of town.
15. There is **no evidence the Board of Trustees intended to drive black residents out of town.**
Remove this language from the History Report and plaque language (See also item #'s 3, 4, 5 & 14 above).
16. There is a **severe lack of historical context and all sources used express liberal viewpoints.**
Research and analyze more balanced source material and add a proper historical context throughout.
17. **Many stories of pure speculation are used to support a position taken of racial motivation.**
Analyze all source material to identify speculation and remove these stories from the Report & plaques.
18. **Stories from black owned newspapers are most often opinions and bi-lines to promote desegregation.**
Reanalyze these source materials to identify opinions, uncorroborated stories & speculation & treat accordingly.
19. **Corroborating evidence that Bruce's received fair compensation** was presented by Council Member Franklin.
Research & analyze this corroborating evidence for comfort Bruce's received fair compensation (See also #13).
20. **Plight of White property owners affected by Eminent Domain** is not covered in the History Report of Plaques.
Perform research necessary to add information about White property owners.

21. **A need to edit the History Report & plaque language** was recognized and discussed extensively by City Council. Apply a concentrated effort to perform a bipartisan edit of the History Report and plaque language.
22. **Tone lacks balance; a factually accurate history is the primary goal** and extra time is not a concern. Take the time necessary to formulate a fair and balanced tone and a factually accurate history.
23. The Mayor and most Council Members expressed concern about a recent discovery that the **Bruce's weighed-in on the History Report and plaque language even though they are not residents of MB and not on the Board.** All input from the Bruce's Family should be re-evaluated for factual content due to appearance of a conflict.

DETAILS OF ISSUES + COMMENTARY + RECOMMENDATIONS + TRANSCRIPT

The next section below shows (i) open issues raised in bold Italics with a corresponding number, (ii) commentary in Italics and, in some cases, excerpts from History Advisory Board meetings, (iii) steps recommended to resolve issues in bold red ink, and (iv) excerpts from transcript of 7/20/21 Council meeting to document the details of issues raised by City Council Members regarding the History Report adopted 6/16/21 and plaque language proposed on 7/20/21.

1. Report's early-on position that Racist Motivation was behind Eminent Domain action may now be in question

The stated position of Racist Motivation in the History Report and plaque language warrants re-evaluation after the issues raised by City Council as enumerated below are researched, analyzed and settled.

Excerpts from 7/20/21 City Council Meeting:

Ally: So plaque number one really was to focus on the Bruce family and their legacy, their history. It also talks about the condemnation proceedings, **the racist motivation behind the Eminent Domain action**, as well as the Bruce's legacy that they left here in Manhattan Beach.

*[Memo: The statements below that there is no mention of the plight of **white property owners** affected by Eminent Domain is brought up later in the meeting by Council Member Montgomery. See Section #20.]*

Excerpts from 7/20/21 City Council Meeting:

Ally: And so **the language does focus on the black families** that owned property and had structures in this area. The names of the other **white owners** would be present on that map, that I showed you earlier, as identified property owners and they did research those other property owners who were white and were **unable to find any real information about those individuals** so the focus really is for this plaque on the historic plaque Enclave - on the families who owned property and had houses there during that time period.

2. QR codes on plaques will link readers to the History Report posted on the City's website

[QR codes on plaques will link readers to the History Report posted on the City's website. And the History Report will be used as a source for MBUSD and other school district curriculums. Therefore, the History Report should be updated for the issues raised by City Council herein, as well as new information as it becomes available.]

Excerpts from 7/20/21 City Council Meeting:

Ally: Another option that the History Advisory Board was recommending was also including a QR code so that individuals who are interested in – to learn more or who wanted to provided information or updated information could do that by scanning a **QR code and then it would bring them to um that city's website** with additional information, for anyone who is interested because there is the coverage is so much that it can't all fit on the front but we do have the **history report and our own website that can provide additional information for anyone seeking it.**

3. MB allowed the Black Slaughter Family to open a Beach House for people of color in spite of a City Ordinance that banned new developments of this nature at the Slaughter's location.

4. Property of 3 black property owners was not taken by Eminent Domain even though all of their lots were immediately adjacent to land taken by MB for a park.

These facts conflict with position that the Board was racially motivated and MB tried to run Black property owners out of town as reflected in the History Report & on plaques, so this point should be made in the History Report and considered for inclusion in plaque language.

Excerpts from 7/20/21 City Council Meeting:

Mayor Pro Tem Hildy Stern: Thank you and thank you Ally, again and again and again. Um as Pro Tem council we realize how much we appreciate you and the advisory board and the other members of staff who have worked on this. Um so my question that I don't know if this might be a question for a member of the Advisory Board, is in looking at the list of those who identified on the black on, the historic black Enclave who used the specific recommended language, um there are the those who owned property at that time, but I was noticing that there were two names that I don't see listed here. Um and it was the **McCastills** and the **Urbans**. And I'm wondering why they weren't listed. I know that there was **one other family [Slaughter's]** that's listed here who didn't have property that was a part of the specific Eminent Domain um and I'm wondering if there was a reason they weren't listed as well.

Kristin Long:the Mc Castills and the Urbans they were actually outside the property. They were located on the south side of 26th Street, so um the reason we didn't include them, and we did include the Slaughters was because the Slaughters were significantly involved in the what, what's kind of being called the NAACP swindling and they also came to be known as the um they took over for Bruce's Beach. **The weekend that the Bruce's left Manhattan Beach [May 1927] the Slaughters opened their boarding house** and they actually advertised as being formerly known as Bruce's Beach. So um that's why we, we included them and not the others.

Kristin Long continues: So the **Slaughters um opened their ah their boarding house um on that Memorial Day weekend of 1927.** So that was right after the Bruce's turned the, all of the families actually turned over all of their property to the city. Uh and then on um so and the exact address was 120 26th Street, which would be in between Ocean and Manhattan Avenue, um **on 26th Street and that is on the south side. So it's actually outside of the condemned area.** They operated until about 1930. According to Brigham's Thesis, he said that um a mortgage company ended up taking over their property um and, and that's really all we know at this point because I haven't been able to find information from the uh from that mortgage company.

5. The Black Slaughter Family was included in the MB community as a "prominent" family.

Again, these facts conflict with the report's position that Eminent Domain was racially motivated and MB tried to run Black property owners out of town in the 1920's and this point should be made in the History Report and considered for inclusion in plaque language.

Excerpts from 7/20/21 City Council Meeting:

Kristin Long continues:

They were prominent in the sense that **not only did their children go to Manhattan Beach schools, one daughter, Stella, was actually a member of the Glee Club and was featured on the front page of the Manhattan Beach news,** which is also in Janet Dempsey's book for her 7th grade class at Center Street School. So they were residents, and they were part of the community ...

6. MB Police arresting a lady of color for Trespassing is not Racist

The story about Elizabeth Cali should be completely deleted from the report as being off-topic and unfounded. She lost her lawsuit in MB City Court and subsequent appeal filed against the City of MB in LA Superior Court wherein her attorney filed a complaint of Racism related to accusing MB Police of harassment.

Excerpts from 7/20/21 City Council Meeting:

Steve Napolitano: Ok. So to settle the issues and there's two or three of them that I saw, some issues that I saw were the issue of you know no presence, no trespassing signs were posted virtually in front of the Bruce's property on street, on the strip of beach owned by subdivider, George Peck, and the point that was made in the email was that **since when is it racist to put a no trespassing sign on private property?**

Kristin Long: Well it's not racist to put a no trespassing sign on private property except for the fact that the only people who were told they could not cross over this land ah to get to the water were the black visitors to the beach.

7. Who used the term "Invasion?" Was it actually Brigham in his 1954 Thesis?

8. Videos of Board meetings reveal that the Bruce Family had substantive input into the History Report, including the addition of language that makes it seem like George Lindsey used the term "invasion."

*[During the History Advisory Board meeting on 5/17/21, at 1hr:38min, Isla Garraway and Lindsay Fox began presenting recommended wording for the history report that they said they had received from **Anthony Bruce and Dwayne Shepherd**, spokesman for the Bruce's Family that has vowed to sue MB. After presenting lots of additions to language recommended by Anthony Bruce and Dwayne Shepherd, Isla Garraway presented language Shepherd had recommended that would portray George Lindsay as having used the term "negro invasion" in the 1920's to influence the Board to enact Eminent Domain. Kristin Long responded by stating she could not find evidence of that anywhere. Nonetheless, Isla Garraway went on to advocate for wording that would communicate that sentiment by avoiding the use of direct quotes.*

*Isla then argued that the we [the Board] definitely wanted the Bruce's family to give the Board insight as to **what they wanted** in their family story and that the recommendations she had presented from Anthony Bruce and Dwayne Shepherd were the things they wanted to include in their "family story."*

The final result regarding the "invasion" term was the inclusion of confusing language in the History Report that could be interpreted to mean Lindsey said "invasion" even though the phrase was actually only used by Brigham.]

This entire section of the report regarding the "invasion" term should be deleted due to a complete lack of evidence. And, participation in the process of preparing an accurate History Report and plaque language by the Bruce's Family and its representative should be announced to the general public because they were not authorized by City Council and it obviously appears at best to be a blatant conflict of interest.

Excerpts from 7/20/21 City Council Meeting:

Steve Napolitano: And then the next one um the invasion by African Americans – I seem to remember that taken from a um a story in a newspaper is that correct or **where did the word invasion come from?**

Kristin Long: It's hard, it was a, it was quite common that um we first we found an article in the New York Times form about 1912 that talked about the "**Negro Invasion**", that's in quotes, um and it was kind of this white/slight theory um you know where, where they were encouraging people to not sell to members of the African American race and so it became a very popular just phrase that was used for the idea of black people coming into a white community and white people moving away.

Steve Napolitano: Ok.

Kristin Long: And sorry. So in this context, **it came about in ah Brigham's Thesis and it was unclear that whether or not it was just George Lindsay who said that he feared an invasion or if Brigham was saying invasion**, but the thing is that it was what I learned from this whole process that was the term Negro Invasion was a common thing. It you know ah you know like I, I don't want to equate it to anything but essentially it was just a phrase that was commonly used at that time to discuss this behavior.

9. KKK – There is NO evidence of KKK involvement or influence on the Board of Trustees in deciding to enact Eminent Domain and the idea of including stories about the KKK came from the Bruce Family

[During the question & answer session in the transcript below, Council Member Napolitano asked Kristin Long of the History Advisory Board the same basic question about the KKK eight (8) times in a row as if he was inquiring for the very first time if there was any evidence the KKK influenced the Board of Trustees to enact Eminent Domain based on racial discrimination. This seems like political theater for the benefit of the audience because Napolitano served as co-chair of the Bruce's Beach Task Force from the start, so he had firsthand knowledge of this situation, as well as other issues raised by Napolitano herein regarding use of the "invasion" term, the Grand Jury, etc.

Portions of a transcript from the 7/20/21 City Council meeting displayed below show that inclusion of stories about the KKK was a hot topic and excerpts from meetings of the History Advisory Board show that the Bruce Family recommended inclusion of KKK stories even though there is no evidence of KKK involvement or influence over the Board of Trustees re the Eminent Domain decision (See also section #23 wherein a discussion between Council Members and the Mayor seems to indicate the Bruce Family involvement is a new discovery.

After Council Member Napolitano asked Kristin Long 3 times about where the idea came from to included stories about the KKK in the History Report and plaque language, Ms. Long answered it was based on "an important note from the Bruce family to mention the Klan." When Napolitano then followed by asking if that is why the KKK stories are included, Ms. Long said "No, No, No." After being asked a 7th time if there is any evidence to show the KKK influenced the Board of Trustees, Ms. Long answered "In so far as the Klan's involvement, I don't know" but the stories are nonetheless included in the History Report and plaque language and often referred to by Dwayne

Shepherd and politicians advocating for restitution and even included in the Resolution of Condemnation passed by City Council in April 2021.

Videos of History Advisory Board meetings referred to below contain lots of evidence that the Bruce Family and Dwayne Shepherd made substantive recommendations to include stories about the KKK in the History Report and plaque language, as follows (See also Sections 8 & 9 for more examples of influence by Dwayne Shepherd):

During the 5/17/21 meeting of the History Advisory Board meeting at some point between 1hr:19min and 1hr:38min, Isla Garraway recommended adding language to the history report that she and Lindsey Fox had received from **Anthony Bruce and Dwayne Shepherd**, as follows: "Following the opening of Bruce's Beach, harassment from white neighbors began." Kristin Drew objected by stating she did not think that was accurate because "it started as a little stand." Isla Garraway then suggested that the Board should **"include the KKK somewhere"** based on an argument that **"the Bruce Family feels like the role of or influence or presence of the KKK is an important part of this story."** Kristin Drew then pointed out that there was no evidence of the presence of the KKK until the late 1920's [long after the Eminent Domain decision]. But Isla Garraway did not give up and suggested that the Board revisit KKK involvement and **"see if we can fit it in somewhere else."**

One of the more prominent Far Left professors chosen by the Board as a reviewer even criticized the Board's reliance on a Far Left book known as "Birth of a Nation" as a source to add stories about the KKK stories- they "seem like a distraction" because there wasn't any "direct causation" [by the KKK in MB regarding Eminent Domain.]

All stories and references to the KKK should be removed from the History Report and plaque language due to a complete lack of evidence of involvement or influence of the KKK during the timeframe of the Eminent Domain decision by the MB Board of Trustees.

Excerpts from 7/20/21 City Council Meeting:

Steve Napolitano: Ok. And then under the, the point the, **the racist motivation behind the eminent domain action, the first part of that uh seems to ah puts great weight on the** California Eagle Report regarding Ku Klux Klan. I seem to remember a, a bit of hesitation in the history report though giving any real attribution of actions to Ku Klux Klan because it wasn't for certain that the members – any member did something in regards to Bruce's Beach that we could find. Can you elaborate on that? (#1)

Kristin Long: Well, first of all just because I don't know that it is necessary to actually put all of the orders on the Ku Klux Klan, I think that the truth is that the Klan really didn't become active in this area until about 1924, which is of course when the Bruce's, when the covington had started, **the legitimate actions of the racist action against the black homeowners really started around um 1926 & 27.** And then or actually it began, in 1927 into 28, or there were you know arson, um dynamite, gun shots, and burning crosses and then in February of 1928, that was when there was the grand jury investigation into a number of individuals in Manhattan Beach that didn't actually ah come to any conclusion. There were no indictments and for what reason I'm not quite sure, but it was in the newspapers, all sorts of newspapers, across the country.

Steve Napolitano: Ah sorry. Were the last but I guess that my question, **the last sentence of that paragraph the article suggested the Klan influenced the Board of Trustees in condemning Bruce's Beach. Do we have evidence of that besides the fact that it was stated in the newspaper?(#2)**

Kristin Long: Ah well, no not that, it was definitely the Klan but as far, it's it being racially motivated, yes, **we have that in there.**

Steve Napolitano: Right. No I'm not questioning that it's just the, the relation of the Klan though **and is that something that really should be included here?(#3)**

Kristin Long: That's an excellent question and you know I think that, thank you for asking it. Um **I think it, it was an important note from the Bruce family to mention the Klan and um I think that ah they feared that the Klan was more involved from the very beginning, and they weren't, I mean** it's just, I'm sorry, that **that's not in the evidence** but what is in the evidence is that beginning with ah, you know, the Inglewood fires um they were you know the just

10. *Even though they were not authorized by City Council to do so, representatives of the Bruce's Family, including Dwayne Shepherd, provided the History Advisory Board with substantive recommendations for language that was included in the History Report and proposed plaques, including language that seems to enhance the Bruce's Family claim for damages in a lawsuit threatened by Dwayne Shepard on many occasions. Perhaps, the worst part is that none of this was disclosed to residents even though there is an obvious appearance of a blatant conflict of interest (See also Sections 8 & 9 for more examples of their influence and see Section 23 for a discussion of this topic between Council Members and the Mayor).*

[In addition to evidence presented that the Bruce Family recommended substantive levels of uncorroborated stories that were included in the History Report and plaque language as mentioned above, the Bruce Family representatives also recommended wording that would seem to help justify higher claims and rewards in a threatened lawsuit, as follows:

During the 5/17/21 History Advisory Board meeting starting at 1hr:19min, Isla and Lindsey read the following new language recommendations from Dwayne Shepherd, spokesman for the Bruce Family: (i) instead of just saying the Bruce's were subject to harassment, say it was harassment from the KKK and white residents, (ii) change the description of the Bruce's facility from "dressing rooms" to "beach bath house," and (iii) include a list of amenities, like lodging, etc.

During another Board meeting, Anthony Bruce asked the Board to remove a positive story from the History Report wherein Bernard Bruce had been quoted as saying the "Bruce family was happy" during an interview in 2007 at the site of Bruce's Beach after a public ceremony to renamed the park after the Bruce Family.]

Excerpts from 7/20/21 City Council Meeting:

Steve Napolitano: But well and Kristan I'm sorry to interrupt but I, I just don't want to go too long here because I know other people have questions or statements to make, you know, the public waiting. But so **it's in here because of the Bruce family?** I mean (#4)

Kristin Long: **No, No, No.**

Steve Napolitano: Well I guess **my question is why is it in here then if we don't have supportive**, maybe in a larger contextual way, it's appropriate as some people have said that relations and everything in the 20s, 1920s. **But why is this here in regards to racist motivation behind the eminent domain action specific to Bruce's Beach here in Manhattan Beach.**(#5)

Kristin Long: Well, I think one of the more significant **stories** that um that was **in the race paper from the California Eagle** was about the gentlemen who were fishing over the **Redondo Pier** and they were handed a pamphlet with KKK ah paraphernalia that was talking about the pure idealism or whatever of pure Americanism and they said that uh that somebody, in that in the margin of that pamphlet it said you know, colored beach three miles north. And I think that that was a very visual story. Um that, that kind of showed the presence of the Klan in the South Bay. And then also don't forget um that well **I guess that was when near the fire in '26 or in '27.**

Steve Napolitano: But again, that, that last sentence do we even, though a newspaper with who knows what source of if any who said that it was written but **we don't have anything showing the Klan influenced the Board of Trustees, is that correct?**(#6)

Kristin Long: **Ah you're right.** I mean all we have is that newspaper and then we also

Steve Napolitano: **I don't know if I'm right that's why I'm asking you. You've done the research.** (#7)

Kristin Long: No, No. I have done the research. I have looked, explored it all um there is no question in my mind that it was racially motivated. **In so far as the Klan's involvement, I don't know [Final Answer].** The Klan didn't keep, you know, very good records.

11. **ALERT - Frank Daugherty was not on MB Board of Trustees when Eminent Domain resolution was passed**

[This is a shocking revelation at this late date at the end of an 8 month long process after City Council already issued a Resolution of Condemnation, adopted the History Report and is in the final stages of debating plaque language.

*This discovery is extremely important because statements made by Frank Daugherty in 1943 during a “tell-all” interview with a local newspaper was the foundational premise for a position taken early in the process of writing the History Report that the Board of Trustees was guilty of **racial discrimination**. This also demonstrates why stories not corroborated by at least one other person or source is not considered to be factual evidence by history experts. It is important to note here that the vast majority of stories in the History Report and plaque language are not corroborated by a second source and many are outright speculation and opinions.*

During his interview, 19 years after the Board of Trustees voted to enact Eminent Domain, Frank Daugherty was 80 years old and he claimed to have been a member of the Board of Trustees when the vote was taken and made statements that the Board enacted Eminent Domain to get rid of the Bruce’s among other confessions as if he was actually a member of the Board, which now prove to be complete fabrications or “contested memories” at best.

Proof that Frank Daugherty was not a member of the Board of Trustees during the relative timeframe is provided by the 6/6/24 edition of “Manhattan Beach News” (p1) that listed the names of all 5 Board members and Daugherty’s name is not included. The 5 Trustees named in the article were Delavan, Robbins, Crandall, Rhind and Edwards. Another shocking fact is that footnote #72 on p25 of History Report contains this same list of Board Members that voted to enact the Complaint of Eminent Domain, perhaps taken from the same source or from the cover page of Brigham’s Thesis that contains the same list of Board Members.]

The entire story about Frank Daugherty must be deleted from the History Report and plaque language. This also emphasizes the need to remove all uncorroborated stories, opinions and speculation from the History Report and plaque language because it cannot be assumed that these stories are factual. See also Section #1, which is a reminder that the position taken the Board of Trustees acted out of a racial motivation must be reconsidered after considering all of the major issues raised by City Council on 7/20/21 and this shocking new discovery.

Excerpts from 7/20/21 City Council Meeting:

Steve Napolitano: Ah again, I’m not questioning the racial motivation behind it all. I think that’s been well established by your research, by Frank Daugherty’s statement, by lots of things, but again when it comes to the Klan and facts supporting the inclusion of that on a plaque, that again we’re trying to get right, which we didn’t get right in 2007, that we continuing to strive to get right now, I don’t know that that [the Klan] should be in there then right?(8)

[Memo: Kristin Long never does really provide clarity if stories about KKK involvement or influencing the Board of Trustees will be deleted from the history report and plaque language even though there is NO evidence.]

Kristin Long: Well there’s something you know, one thing to also remember is the Klansmen wore hoods so we couldn’t always tell who they were and there was a reason for that, they hid right?

Steve Napolitano: Of course.

12. There is No Evidence of a Grand Jury investigation or Racial Violence in MB, and this uncorroborated story pertained to a time period that was 3 – 4 years after the decision was made to enact Eminent Domain

[During the 6/7/21 History Advisory Board meeting, statements were made that there is no evidence of a Grand Jury investigation in MB regarding racial violence in MB and that the story pertains to 1927 – 1928, long after the Eminent Domain decision in 1924. And again, during the 6/17/21 Board meeting at 1hr:06min, Board members expressed disappointment that there is no evidence of a Grand Jury investigation of race related violence in MB. And it was stated that this would have been long after the Eminent Domain decision. Board members then made a decision to leave in stories of terror, like bombings, guns shots and fires in the History Report even though these were primarily uncorroborated stories and they pertained to a period of time long after the Eminent Domain decision.] **Therefore, all stories related to a Grand Jury investigation and racial violence in MB must be removed from the History Report & plaques because they are misleading.**

Excerpts from 7/20/21 City Council Meeting:

Kristin Long: Um and again like I said that they, they, it wasn’t very well documented and if only we can get those grand jury ah files if anyone knows how to do that, that would be amazing. Um to find out who exactly was involved.

13. Open Question about Unfair Compensation to Bruce Family in History Report & Plaque language

[Kristin Long stated below during the 7/20/21 Council meeting and during History Advisory Board meetings that the Bruce’s received compensation for their property that was “above market value.”

The History Advisory Board received the Eminent Domain Court documents, as noted during the 6/2/21 Board meeting at 1hr:26min into the meeting, and the Board has a copy of Brigham's Thesis that contains all the important facts from the court proceedings. Here are the facts per Brigham. The Bruce's waived their right to trial by jury, then did not exercise their right to trial by 3 independent Referees and instead relied on a panel of 3 independent appraisers appointed by the Court to determine a fair compensation for their property.

The Bruce's attorney had also stated publically that the Bruce's would turn over their land to the City if they received a fair price, which they did in 1927, 2 years before the Eminent Domain proceedings were completed, based on compensation for a valuation of \$14,500.

Therefore, there is no reason why the Board should leave this as an open question. However, language in the History Report was crafted that makes it appear to the reader that the question of fair compensation is an open issue by stating that the Bruce's received less than the \$70,000 they had requested in the response filed by their attorney to the Complaint of Eminent Domain. Regarding the Bruce's request for \$50,000 in damages for racial discrimination, the Bruce's received the full benefits of due process of law, as noted by Brigham, and they were represented by a competent attorney from the NAACP.

In transcript excerpts shown in item #19 below, Council Member Joe Franklin presents factual information that corroborates a conclusion that the Bruce's received fair compensation. The Bruce's bought a house in LA for \$7,500, which represents a present-day equivalent to \$31mil based on the present value of \$7,500 increasing at an annually compounded rate of 9.5% based on average annual growth of the S&P 500 since 1927 when the Bruce's were paid. The Bruce's also purchased 2 commercial properties according to Franklin's research.]

The History Report and Plaques should state unequivocally that the Bruce's received compensation for their property that was above market value and received due process related to their claim for a higher amount and a complaint of racial discrimination, which was denied by the Court based on the evidence presented.

Excerpts from 7/20/21 City Council Meeting:

Steve Napolitano: Right. So then another um point that was brought up in the emails were under the Legacy of Bruce's Beach paragraph where the issue of although they received compensation, it was far less than they requested for their property and thriving business. **So that goes to the question of whether the compensation was fair or not and who judges whether it's fair or not.** And that's an issue that's been brought up in, in those anonymous, as to why you know the implication that, that something was taken from them without fair compensation. Obviously, again the motivation behind it – wrong - but in terms of the amount of compensation, we don't **do we know whether that was undercompensated or not?**

Kristin Long: Well based on the other property values that we found at the time, **it was above ah market value.** But the question is, the statement says what they requested, and they requested, I think it was \$150,000, I believe. So

Steve Napolitano: Right. Again **the implication** is though that there was **something wrong** about the **compensation?**

Kristin Long: I understand the implication. It's a, we don't know what the exact value of the business was but um we can only tell you what the value of the property was.

14. Here is another untold story that clearly shows MB went against the grain of legal segregation in the 1920's

See similar stories in section numbers 3, 4 & 5 above. The History Report and Plaques should tell these stories in the proper context of an era of segregation that was both legal and widely exercised across the country and it serves as evidence that the Board did not enact Eminent Domain to run Black property owners out of town.

Excerpts from 7/20/21 City Council Meeting:

Steve Napolitano: Ok. And **was there any mention what, why no mention of the fact that uh four out of the five ah property owners involved in the culmination of repurchasing of Manhattan Beach.**

Kristin Long: Um, I think it was just for condense, for you know, being succinct. Um there was so much that I wanted to include on this plaque, but I was constantly reminded from my fellow History Advisory Board members that this is a plaque we want to keep people interested and as a writer everyone knows no one likes to read. So um

Steve Napolitano: Is this something for the QR code maybe?

Kristan Long: Precisely, yes.

15. There is no evidence the Board of Trustees intended to drive black residents out of town

[Council Member Franklin points out below that black property owners affected by Eminent Domain were allowed to repurchase property in MB and all but the Bruce's did just that. During the 1920's, under the Plesy v Ferguson Supreme Court decision, the City or land developer, George Peck, could have restricted people of color from buying property in MB but chose not to do so.] **Any language about the Racist intentions of the Board of Trustees in the History Report and proposed plaque language should be reconsidered (See also #'s 3,4,5 & 14).**

Excerpts from 7/20/21 City Council Meeting:

Joe Franklin:

So the next one in that same section is the next line about **ordinances aimed to thwart the Bruce's business and drive the black community out of the city.** Well that's I don't think that was the intention of the Board of Trustees was to drive was to drive away every single black resident out of the city. If that were the case, then why were all the black families allowed to re-purchase in Manhattan Beach? So that's not very clear, it's not very precise, and **this fact does not support an effort to drive the black community out of the city.** So I think that has to be looked at.

16. There is a need for historical context and for sources not known for liberal viewpoints

[Below, Council Member Franklin recommends adding historical context and information from sources that are not left leaning by reading from a book published by Dr. Josh Sides, a highly respected author on the subject of African American in the early days of Los Angeles and California after the Civil War.

During the 6/7/21 meeting of the History Advisory Board at 30min:25sec, members discuss recommendations from various reviewers of the History Report and plaque language to add context throughout. Ariela Gross, JD, PhD, recommended "more historical context would be useful, and preferably not in an addendum at the end."

Lindsey Fox proclaimed that "integrating context will take too much time" and she is considering adding a statement at the very beginning of the History Report [to supplement the brief reference already included in the summary of resources shown in a grid near the end of the Report].

Beginning at 36min:08sec on 6/7/21, Lindsey Fox says "Dr. Gross is all we need" and continues on to claim that the Board has "complied with public comments" and states "History expert feedback has been obtained."

Dr. Gross is a Far Left law professor at USC that teaches a Race related curriculum and wrote 3 Race related books. The other 3 "experts" Lindsey Fox is referring to are all Far Left instructors at UCLA, including 2 that serve on the "Culture & Equity Project" at UCLA Center X and 1 Associate Professor on African American Studies.

THIS IS FAR LEFT ONLY INPUT, NOT FAIR & NOT BALANCED and DOES NOT SATISFY PUBLIC COMMENTS!

These statements by Lindsey Fox capture the essence of the tone deaf direction of this entire effort from the beginning when City Council failed to consider a fair and balanced approach to represent the viewpoints of all residents (like the "Gang of 8" in DC). The vast majority of residents that City Council appointed to the Bruce's Beach Task Force were Far Left, including both co-chairs, Council Members Stern and Napolitano, while passing over more balanced and well informed candidates, like Gary McAulay, President of the MB Historical Society.

Appointees included Lindsey Fox is a member of the Equity, Diversity, Social Justice and Inclusion Committee formed by MBUSD and the Far Left group known as "MB United," Isla Garraway, a member that often brought forth and fought vigorously for recommendations communicated to her by Anthony Bruce and Dwayne Shepherd, spokesman for the Bruce Family, that has vowed to sue MB for racial discrimination, Allison Hayes and Anthony Lee, 2 known Racial Activists. Also appointed to the Task Force were 5 other members of the Far Left group known as "MB United" - Taylor Gamble, Amanda Park, Lana Rizika, Michael Jenkins and Laura Kainsinger.

Example of Bias: AT THE BEGINNING OF THE VERY FIRST MEETING BEFORE ANY RESEARCH BEGAN, Council Member Stern instructed the Task Force to form sub-committees to start working on a "Resolution of Apology" and a list of "Continued Efforts" for the Task Force to fight "Institutional Racism" in MB. Council Member Napolitano defended Stern by saying he did not see any reason why the beginning document that Stern's actions were based on was not true. This foundational document primarily consisted of excerpts taken from a book written by a Racial Activist, Allison Jefferson, and an amateur Master's Thesis written by a Far Left local resident,

Robert Brigham, that was referred to as a “Communist Sympathizer” by a MB newspaper at the time he wrote his Thesis in the 1950’s.

The Board should research additional sources that are not known for liberal viewpoints to add fair and balanced information, plus add historical context throughout the History Report and plaque language. The definitive solution would be to engage a professional, bipartisan history firm that would use history experts.

Excerpts from 7/20/21 City Council Meeting:

Joe Franklin continues:

Also I’d like to **add some historical context** from the from the book *LA City Limits African American Los Angeles from the Great Depression to the Present*. So ah this was published by the University of California Press and written by Josh Sides, professor, ah doctor Josh Sides who’s a professor – ah award winning wit set professor of California history at the California State University in North Ridge and the director of the Center for Southern California studies. **He was also recommended by Dr. Ariel Gross, professor of law and history at USC in the professional review feedback that was provided in the pack on June 15th in that report.** So here’s the book here, in case you happen to see it. I purchased it because I wanted to mark it up and mark it up, I did. And indicated part of my research here. And in fact, it was used in one reference for the ah history report. So he says, “Jefferson Elman’s editor of the black Los Angeles newspaper the *Liberator* declared in 1902 that “California is the greatest state for the negro”. And in 1911 when he elaborated “only a few years ago the bulk of your present-colored population came here from the south without any money in search of better things and we are not disappointed. The hospitable white people received them kindly, employed at good wages, treated them as men and women, furnished their children with the best educational advantages everywhere, feeling perfectly safe, the colored population planted themselves.” While I’m sure we can agree that its highly likely that a good number, if not the majority of the six hundred residents of Manhattan Beach at the time just fifteen miles away in a red cart ride from Los Angeles, would have the same hospitable attitude to want black home ownership as was found in nearby Los Angeles. **So I just, just wanted to introduce that as historical context, I think that we didn’t hear before.**

17. Speculation should be removed from the History Report & plaque language

[Council Member Franklin complained below about statements of pure speculation being included in the History Report and plaque language and provided several examples taken from the *American Eagle*, a black activist newspaper, Allison Jefferson’s book, a known Racial Activist, and the amateur level Master’s Thesis prepared by Robert Brigham, which represent the vast majority of sources in the History Report.

History experts from a professional, bipartisan history firm would not include pure speculation and would clearly separate uncorroborated stories from facts by pushing stories down into the footnote section of the History Report.] **Remove all statements from the History Report and plaque language that represent speculation and move uncorroborated stories to the footnote section of the History Report.**

Excerpts from 7/20/21 City Council Meeting:

Joe Franklin continues:

So the next section, I’d like to talk about is the **racist motivations behind the eminent domain action**. So, in there was the line “The Eagle **speculated** that the Klan was “operating unrestrictedly along the waterfront, including Manhattan Beach.”But the word I want to focus on is **speculated**. **It’s inaccurate when the word speculated is going to be used to describe Ku Klux Klan activity in Manhattan Beach when the facts don’t support it.** The Advisory Board History Report quotes a piece from The California Eagle on page 36 of the report. “The Bruce’s have been in Manhattan Beach for thirteen years and were among the first settlers of that end of the beach. **But it’s understood that some Ku Klux who recently moved into the vicinity objected to the presence of colored folks and have so manipulated their objection that they have reached out and influenced the servants of the people who reside over the City Council and this august body has condemned Bruce’s Beach as a pleasure resort for colored people”.** So this was the references a piece of the article or the article was called Klan’s operations, The California Eagle and it’s on page 36 of the History Advisory Report. So continuing to quote the Advisory History Report, **“These accounts were recited nearly thirty years to Robert Brigham after they were alleged to have occurred and some were not from firsthand experience calling into question the validity and credibility.** With further research however we discovered reports by a variety of sources that collaborate acts of violence against members of the Black community in Manhattan Beach.” And again this is page 37 of the History Advisory Report. The History Advisory Report proceeds to list three pages, pages 37-39, of **Racist and intimidating events from newspaper records and Grand Jury actions.** “There is no doubt that these events occurred, and it was likely, and they were Racist, Racially motivated and it was likely some bias was at play with the prosecution.”

But there is no conclusive evidence drawn to definitively point to evidence of Ku Klux Klan involvement. The use of the word speculated regarding Klan involvement does not belong on a plaque describing this history.

Going on the article, “the article **suggested** that the Klan influenced the Board of Trustees in condemning Bruce’s Beach”. This is from the History Advisory Report. So Dr. Allison Jefferson wrote, “Based on current available evidence **we can only speculate** whether the KKK’s activity may have influenced the Manhattan Beach City Council on the condemnation proceedings of the Bruce’s Beach establishment”. Or as stated in the Bruce’s Beach Task Force report, “**There was no activity evidence directly linking acts of harassment to the KKK**”. **Combined with the word speculated suggests it is just as ambiguous.** So Dr. Ariela Gross, who is the John B in Alice R. Sharp’s profession of Law and History at the University of Southern California Goal School of Law who is featured prominently in the History Advisory Board, “you know, professional review feedback document” stated the following in her email to the History Advisory Board dated June 4, 2021. In her first paragraph, Dr. Gross writes, “Indeed there were several places in the L.A. area where Black people could own property ever near the beach where similar condemnation of Black owned property took place. Santa Monica is another one. This was just not one of the mechanisms available to those who were showed the more violent tactics of the Ku Klux Klan”. **Again where’s the factual proof of KKK involvement in Manhattan Beach and influencing the Board of Trustees?**

18. Stories from black owned newspapers are most often opinions and bi-lines to promote desegregation

[Council Member Franklin provides statements below from Dr. Josh Sides that black owned newspapers primarily publish uncorroborated stories and opinions to promote activism [versus factual articles] and that this is the most frequently used source for stories told in the History Report.] **All source material from black activist newspapers, books published by Racial activists like Allison Jefferson and amateurs like Brigham should be reread and analyzed more closely to determine if the stories are factual and then treated accordingly. This is exactly what experts from a professional, bipartisan history firm will do as part of their services.**

Excerpts from 7/20/21 City Council Meeting:

Joe Franklin continues:

So to provide more historical context Dr. Josh Sides, in LA City Limits again referring to the book *LA City Limits*, on page 30, relates his research into the newspapers of the day. He says, “**The black press of Los Angeles played a crucial role in politicizing its readers more than simply conveying newsworthy information, the California Eagle and the Los Angeles Sentinel, the city’s two most influential black newspapers, prodded their leadership to challenge racial discrimination**”. So yes, that’s fine. We see that in newspapers today. But where was the line drawn and did, they draw the line between what was news and what was editorial. **So, quotes from the California Eagle appear fifteen times in the History Advisory Board report. So the point being as was said earlier through the questioning is that does this reference to the Ku Klux Klan really belong on this plaque.**

19. There is corroborating evidence that the Bruce’s received fair compensation

[Council Member Franklin presents corroborating evidence below that the Bruce’s received fair compensation and warns against using misleading language that the Bruce’s received less than they requested. **This subject is covered thoroughly in Section #13 above. The History Report and plaque language should state that the Bruce’s were paid an amount that exceeded the fair market value of their property.**

Excerpts from 7/20/21 City Council Meeting:

Joe Franklin continues:

And then moving on to item number six on my list, and it has to do with the **compensation**. “On May 16, 1927, the Bruce family left Manhattan Beach, although they received compensation it was far less than they requested for their property and thriving business.” And Kristin Drew Long did say quoting her “**that the value, that it was above market value**”, what they received. So, there was information that was provided for background, they originally asked for \$70,000 for the property, \$50,000 in damages for the value of their businesses. These defendants will be ousted. I’m sorry “if the lands described in the complaint are condemned, these defendants will be ousted from their homes and will be unable and are unable to procure other homes”. This is again quoting from the report. So in Manhattan Beach because they are black, because they were black, but this was not likely, and again this is the report, **but this is not likely a condition of the condemnation because of the five black families who owned the condemned property, four bought**

land in other areas of the beach city. The Bruce's were the only family who did not, continuing quoting the report, the Court granted the Bruce's \$14,500 when they turned over the land in 1927. It had been fifteen years since Mrs. Bruce has purchased the lot and she was now sixty-four years old. Charles was sixty-six. They purchased a home at 1042-1044 East 20th Street in Los Angeles and reported to the 1930 US census that it costs \$7,500. Around 1932 Willa and Harvey allegedly purchased two commercial properties at 724 East 33rd Street in Los Angeles and the other at 1339 East 18th Street. So they were able to buy properties, they were able to buy commercial properties, which presumably would have generated income. So, the Bruce family and this is me talking now, the Bruce family paid a total of \$1,235 for the two lots and two transactions and of course they spent money, you know, to build buildings there for their resort. But what I would like to say is that I believe this can be re-worded, re-worded to more accurately reflect the value of the settlement of, in its day. And then finally number seven was just more grammatical, is ah there's "in the legacy of the Bruce's Beach area, section, it says "Although the Bruce family were compelled to abandon their dreams in Manhattan Beach", I think that should say was compelled. Although the Bruce family was compelled to abandon their dreams in Manhattan Beach. So thank you very much.

20. The History Report and Plaques do not cover the plight of White property owners affected by Eminent Domain

[Council Member Montgomery complained that the proposed plaque language omitted information on the white families affected by the Eminent Domain proceedings, which is factual and historically accurate. Kristin Long said earlier in the transcript and again here that there was limited space on the plaques and that as far as the Board could find, "there was no more information to be found out about them."] **More research is needed to obtain information on the White property owners affected. This type of research is at the heart of what expert historians and trained and experienced at doing.**

Excerpts from 7/20/21 City Council Meeting:

Richard Montgomery:Here's my question and I understand and need to, to hear it from you because you can tell me the easy answer. How you did it on plaque number two on recommended plaque two, you focused on the families, the last ones that were the, the Enclave. **My question was why they omitted the white ownership at the same time.** They also did the same with the Eminent Domain. They also did the same, I'm not questioning the basic vote of how we got there, I agree with Steve. We're all on the same page, don't need to recite that again. I got it. **My question is, if we are talking about factual and historical accuracy, how can we omit something that effected more than four people?**

Kristin Long: Basically um, I tried, we all tried to find information about the other, um ten entities, the white entities. There is very little to be found about them. They were not um, they never built a home here in Manhattan Beach. They were not involved in the community in anyway, um compared to the other typical black families who did have albeit, vacation homes or resort homes. They, you know, they were parts of the community and the Bruce's were substantial members of the community. So we listed them because we thought it was important to mention their names. However as far as I could find, and, and my board, co-members could find, **there was no more information to be found out about them.** They were just, there just wasn't information.

Richard Montgomery: Let me rephrase my question. On the property the city owns now, the park, just the park and the park itself, you couldn't find information but the decision on plaque two was to not include any reference to any families besides the four black families you found. Was that the answer?

Kristin Long: Yes. We listed them by name, and I believe that didn't we list them by name on there?

Richard Montgomery: You made no mention of any other names of the others

Suzanne Hadley: **It's on the map.**

21. City Council recognizes the need to edit the History Report and plaque language but leaves the issue hanging

[Council Member Napolitano recommends that the History Report and plaque language be sent back to the History Advisory Board to consider changes related to the issues raised at this meeting. The problem is that members of the History Advisory Board do not have the training or experience needed to properly resolve many of the more important issues raised by Council or to properly perform the edit function. Rather than recognize this fact and discuss the need for experts, Council Member Napolitano suggests that anyone can feel free to edit the History Report and plaque language. Later in the transcript, other Council Members even suggest that

residents are welcome to take a shot at editing, which makes no sense whatsoever.] **ONLY BIPARTISAN EXPERTS ARE QUALIFIED TO EDIT THE HISTORY REPORT AND PLAQUE LANGUAGE AFTER PERFORMING OTHER STEPS.**

Excerpts from 7/20/21 City Council Meeting:

Steve Napolitano:What I would like to do is take everyone's concerns that have been stated tonight and obviously as Kristin said, she, she's reviewed the anonymous emails and we talked a bit about some of the general concerns tonight and some of the issues of the Ku Klux Klan and the compensation issues and things like that. **What I'd like to do is send this back to the History Committee with all the issues that have been raised tonight and let them address that and bring that back and they'll either agree with um, the concerns, and the requests that some of these things be changed, ah or not. Or they'll provide supporting materials or evidence as to the points they've made and then we can review it again. And if someone wants to edit it after that, they can feel free to do that.**

.....I'm sure all the committee members are listening to this now and let's send back these concerns back to the history committee. Let them address them in their way. Um maybe they will want to revise or propose some ah, additional or revised language to address those concerns or they will support um, what their putting forward now with additional evidence or documentation or argument in favor of that.....

22. Council Member Montgomery and Mayor Hadley express the need for a History Report and plaque language that are factually accurate using a fair and balanced tone and to take the time needed to accomplish that

Excerpts from 7/20/21 City Council Meeting:

Richard Montgomery:**When I asked Kristin about why are some things omitted and some are not, folks either didn't tell the whole truth or none of the truth. You can't have it both ways. You can't put people in your historic plaque if they omit things. Good, bad, or ugly. You gotta show all the words at the same time. That's my concern about it. I don't want a selective history. If you are going to do it right, do it right the entire way, don't stop halfway.**

.....Last year in the middle of Covid with everything going on, I watched that tape twice to make sure I was very clear about what I was looking for. **If we want these things to happen, do them correctly. If it takes six months more, take six months more.** We have to address the issues our residents want to see. Fair, historical, factually accurate plaques. **That is what they are charged with.** Whether it was two, three, five, ten plaques, it has to be accurate. This number two plaque does not meet that criteria, by far. Not to mention the points counsel Napolitano Steve brought up earlier were still not there. **Is it on the path, yes. It's, it's on its way. It's getting there. But by no means is it there. I don't understand what the rush is. And why all of a sudden it's big priority to finish it quickly. I'd rather take our time, do it the right way and forget what the county is doing.** It has no bearing on what we're doing, nothing at all. **So I'd say send it back to the committee, I agree with the idea, let them re-write the accurate verbiage and we'll go from there.**

Thank you, your honor.

Mayor Suzanne Hadley:Richard said it well, last **we want a fair, historical, and accurate set of plaques or we want nothing. There is no rush in, in my mind, so please don't feel a rush from council.** You maybe feeling some pressure in the History Advisory Board from the community and that's fair. But **I think you're hearing loud and clear from Council that we want to get this right** as one of my colleagues said, the history on the website can be updated as we get new documents that Kristin Long Drew is asking for and that's great. So when people go to the website it will have updated information, **but the plaque when we buy it, it's purchased, it's fixed,** it's old school and except for the QR code - obviously will link to something that can be updated but the plaque is going to be there for, as Joe said it, at least decades, if not longer and we do want this to be right. **It just must be right.** So, I agree with most of my colleagues. It's too soon to ask tonight, **this is a good first draft.**

I would like to, in my comments discuss **the tone** of what was brought to us tonight.But **let me just tell you what leaps out to me at , on page 118 – the History of Bruce's Beach. These are things I really would like the History Advisory Board to remove. I won't vote for these types of words in a plaque to be honest. To me, this is a thumb on the scale.****I wanted the History of Bruce's Beach on these plaques, and I am Joe Friday, Dagnet, just the facts mam, kind of gal, especially on a very little, tiny canvas. So every word does matter.** I agree with my colleagues, we are not going to word smith. But these are the things I highlighted when I got my council packet and I started to prepare. **So we have words like this that don't all have to go, but they add up to a picture that troubled me. With words like pioneer, racially diverse, Jim Crowe era, exclusionary, immediately, soared, invasion, drive the black community out of the city, speculated, encouraged by the Bruce's success, the legacy, far less, demolished, compelled, and abandoned.** Those

are a lot of words with a lot of emotion, that I would say not only are they very different in tone from page 119, which is the Historic Black Enclave..... But to use words like **abandoned, immediately, invade, drive out**, I would submit that those are not historically common sets of words. It's more of the Amazon Prime version maybe of Bruce's Beach than the History Advisory Board Bruce's Beach. And **when I voted for an accurate history of Bruce's Beach, it wasn't the story, it was the facts**. So, I would love to just not word smith more but to put that back in the lap of the History Advisory Board.

And then the role model paragraph, I do agree with one of my colleagues, **the condemnation paragraph on page 118, could use more context**. It's very brief and it does sort of jump into this ordinance #282 with no context. But that's a really factual paragraph. That's the most factual paragraph on that page. It's almost like it's written by one person and then the rest of the History Advisory Board drafted all the other paragraphs. So I know it's hard in a committee, maybe the committee divided these things up, but the voice is all over the map and the condemnation paragraph is the tightest and the most factual and the driest of them. But to me that's the role model. I really would like it to be drier and factual.

.....I think the History Advisory Board has given us a great skeleton, a great foundation with the headings and the chapters and maybe those of us, and I'm not making anybody do that, but I might, I might not. I don't know, **but there's no reason that even the community couldn't re-write that page as they see fit and we have some alternatives there for the community to weigh in on**. But I will close there. I think you're hearing some not unanimity but some similar comments from all of us that it's a great first cut. We'd like to see more. We'd like it to come back to us and it's too soon to vote tonight. Thank you for your work. I look forward to seeing the next one. We'll see if I have the brain space to take a stab. I see my colleague Steve has his hands up, so I'll stop there. And thank you and I look forward to seeing the next cut. Yes, Steve.

Steve Napolitano: Thank you. Well I would hope that everyone was going to draft their, their own version and I don't just mean that drearly. I mean if, if they're going to take a stab at it, then what they would do is submit that um to the history committee for their review as well and at least give them a stab at it too.

23. Below, Mayor Hadley & Council Members express concern about a recent discovery that the Bruce's weighed-in on the History Report and plaque language even though they are not residents of MB and not on the Board

The best way to resolve this concern and remove any potential problems regarding the appearance of a conflict of interest is to retain the services of an independent, professional, bi-partisan history firm.

Excerpts from 7/20/21 City Council Meeting:

Mayor Suzanne Hadley : Absolutely. I do agree with submitting it to the History Advisory Board, and then lastly I did not tune into the History Advisory Board discussions about the plaques, but **I did hear that some family members of some of the affected Bruce's Beach families were in some of those meetings or submitted comments and, and other ones didn't. And I would just ask the History Advisory Board to just tread lightly there. We do, we want the History Advisory Board to write this. There are no family members as I understand, who are residents of Manhattan Beach, so this should be a, you know, resident, History Advisory Board, and a council decision. So I've just heard rumors and muttering about that, so I'll leave that there, but I think we need to be careful. Somebody even said tonight well the, the Bruce family asked for that to be in there and that, if its accurate and it fits what we're all talking about for the History Advisory Board, the history, the plaque, and what council wants, that's fine. But if it's just a preference from one family over all the families, I'm not sure we want to go there.**

Joe Franklin:In terms of monitoring all the different meetings and things like that, I don't even think all the **meetings are from the History Advisory Board** are posted on the website. So, if you really want to go ahead and follow those, I know I've tried to go back, and take a look at things and stuff like that. But whether it's a technical issue, I believe it's a technical issue but, **let's get those up there so the public can go back and review and do it on a timely basis so** that it is timely, and we can go back and **residents can go and make comments**.

Mayor Suzanne Hadley:.....**Is that true that the History Advisory Board meetings are not posted on the website.**

Ally: There are about half of them posted on the website right now. Um and ah, we are in the process of downloading those and getting them um, creating links for them for the website, and then um finally putting them on our website. Council Member Franklin is correct, not all of them are posted right now. Um, but I will get to that as soon as possible.

Mayor Suzanne Hadley: And why are they not posted and what, what would the delay be?

Bruce: Yeah absolutely and I've loaded Ally with a lot of work and, and I just didn't allow here to prioritize that, so I take full responsibility.

Alexandria Latragna

From: Michael Jenkins <mjenkins1230@icloud.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 21, 2021 10:27 AM
To: Bruces Beach Task Force
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Plaque language

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

CAUTION: This Email is from an EXTERNAL source. Ensure you trust this sender before clicking on any links or attachments.

Members of the Committee,

I write to support the language for the Bruce's Beach plaque that you have developed, but would recommend that you add a sentence noting that because the eminent domain action was racially motivated and not supported by a legitimate public purpose, it was an abuse of governmental authority. In point of fact, had a park been necessary in this area, there was ample undeveloped (and hence, less expensive) land just to the north of Bruces' Beach. Further, no park was even developed for some thirty-plus years, evidencing that there was no public necessity for use of eminent domain to create a park.

Let's not repeat the mistake that was made with the plaque that is currently on the park site — the language should be factual, straightforward and not mince words about the racially discriminatory behavior of the City government and some members in the community in the 1920s. The City must take ownership of its past; that is the only way we can work towards achieving a more diverse, inclusive and equitable community in the future.

The plaque language strikes the right tone. Please resist any pressure to selectively remove words that some regard as inflammatory or to otherwise whitewash the language.

Mike Jenkins
Former Task Force Member
43-year resident

Sent from my iPad

Alexandria Latragna

From: roycasey@aol.com
Sent: Monday, September 20, 2021 2:22 PM
To: Bruces Beach Task Force
Cc: List - City Council
Subject: [EXTERNAL] History Advisory Board responding to issues raised by City Council 7/20/21 and more

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

CAUTION: This Email is from an EXTERNAL source. Ensure you trust this sender before clicking on any links or attachments.

Headline News – It was recently revealed that the “star witness” used in Robert Brigham’s Thesis as the primary evidence for racial discrimination, Frank Daugherty, gave false testimony.

His “tell-all confession” was published in the *Manhattan Beach News*, 2/19/43, p.6, which was 19 years after the Eminent Domain decision when he was 80 years old. Daugherty confessed that the Board of Trustees’ decision to file a Complaint of Eminent Domain was secretly motivated by racial discrimination. This confession was assumed to be based on his firsthand knowledge, and therefore true, because Daugherty said “Being a member of the board, I had to participate or give up MB.” However, evidence has been brought to light that Daugherty was, in fact, not a member of the Board of Trustees when the Eminent Domain decision was made. The evidence is taken from an article in *Manhattan Beach News*, 6/6/24, p.1., which published the names of all 5 Board members that voted on 6/5/24 to enact Eminent Domain, which did not include Daugherty. Ironically, this list also appears on the cover page of Brigham’s Thesis and on page 25 of the History Report as footnote 72.

In addition, after considering the major issues raised by City Council during its 7/20/21, no evidence remains to support a position the Board of Trustees’ decision to enact Eminent Domain was racially motivated, as follows:

- None of the stories about KKK involvement and influence on Eminent Domain are true.
- There was no racial violence in MB during the Eminent Domain timeframe and no Grand Jury investigation.
- Nobody in Manhattan Beach used the term “invasion” to describe people of color buying property in MB.
- Arresting a person of color for trespassing on private property is not Racist.
- The most frequently used source was a Black owned newspapers known for primarily making statements and expressing opinions to encourage people of color to fight segregation, not report factual news.
- Most stories taken from Brigham’s Thesis are stated as speculation, opinions and uncorroborated stories.
- The report is not fair and balanced because all sources express left leaning viewpoints.
- A biased tone is prevalent throughout the History Report and proposed plaque language.
- A historical context is not provided, therefore, all stories are told out of context and thus misleading.
- There is no question the Bruce’s received fair compensation because it “exceeded fair market value”

In fact, many stories in the History Report about the Board of Trustees and MB tell a completely different story.

- All Black property owners affected by Eminent Domain, except the Bruce’s, repurchased property in MB
- The Black Slaughter Family was a prominent family included in the MB Community and Schools

- Slaughter's were allowed to open a Beach House for Black people in 1927 after Bruce's Beach was closed
- Land of the 3 Black property owners located immediately adjacent to Eminent Domain property was not taken

More Breaking News - It was not disclosed that some Board members working on the History Report collaborated with and advocated for recommendations they received from representatives of the Bruce's Family, including Dwayne Shepherd that has vowed to sue the City for racial discrimination. When the History Advisory Board submitted their History Report draft dated 6/7/21, the Board disclosed, for the first time, a list of 4 professors that Board members had collaborated with. These non-residents were not authorized by City Council and they were all left leaning. And it was not disclosed that descendants of the Bruce's and Dwayne Shepherd were providing substantive recommendations.

If it becomes public knowledge that the Board collaborated heavily with Dwayne Shepherd and Bruce Family descendants, it will likely have the appearance of a blatant conflict of interest that was not disclosed. An appropriate way to mitigate this obvious appearance of a conflict is to engage an independent, bipartisan group to perform due diligence on the History Report. This need already exists anyway, as proposed by Council Member Franklin. The scope of work should include analyzing all key source material used in the report to separate facts from uncorroborated stories, speculation and opinions, researching additional sources, application of a historical context throughout the History Report and editing. Care should be taken to engage a professional, bipartisan history firm staffed with unbiased history experts.

If City Council is not willing to approve a healthy due diligence function as recommended above, then the Board should consider taking measures to create transparency and make full disclosure by dividing the report into separate sections for (i) "just the facts," (ii) "uncorroborated stories, opinions and speculation" and (iii) "input provided by descendants of the Bruce's and Dwayne Shepherd" and delete any conclusion about racial discrimination due to a lack of factual evidence.